

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-13, and 15-33 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 13, 19, 24, and 29 are independent. Claims 1, 8, 13, 19, 24, and 29 have been amended for clarity. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. No new matter has been added.

This reply is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination. Reconsideration of the action mailed October 11, 2007, is requested in light of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiners Tank and Vu for the courtesy of an in-person interview on January 23, 2008. The time spent with the applicant's representatives, Hans R. Troesch and Arrienne M. Lezak, was greatly appreciated. The applicant's representatives described an embodiment of the claimed invention to the examiner. The examiner made recommendations for amending the claims. The claims have been amended in view of the examiner's recommendations.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, and 15-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Microsoft Excel 2000, copyright 1999 Microsoft Corporation, as evidenced by Blattner, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Excel 2000" ("Excel"), published by Que Corporation, 1999 ("Blattner"), in view of Bott, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Office 2000", published by Que Corporation, 1999 ("Bott") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371 ("Oran").

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite button constraints that include a range of button heights and a range of button widths. Additionally, claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the destination toolbar constraints include a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation.

In rejecting claim 1, the examiner relied upon the combined teachings of Blattner, Bott, and Oran. Specifically, the examiner relies upon Oran as disclosing button constraints that

include a range of button heights. Oran discloses a resizable taskbar with variable heights. Oran does not disclose or suggest a button having a set of button constraints including a range of button heights. In particular, Oran discloses resizing the taskbar. However, the taskbar is distinct from a button and the resizing of the taskbar does not disclose or suggest the claimed button constraints that include a range of button heights. Instead, Oran discloses modifying the size or position of the taskbar while button heights remain constant. Moreover, the applicant respectfully submits that while FIGS. 3 and 5 show buttons of varying width, a set of button widths does not disclose a range of button heights and a range of button widths, as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, the applicant respectfully submits that Oran does not teach or suggest destination toolbar constraints including a range of toolbar heights for horizontal toolbars and a range of toolbar widths for vertical toolbars, such that when a button is moved from a source toolbar to a destination toolbar, the destination toolbar size does not change and all the buttons on the destination toolbar are a uniform size.

Blattner and Bott do not remedy the deficiencies of Oran. Specifically, Blattner discloses how to copy buttons between toolbars (Blattner, p. 877), where the toolbar automatically resizes to accommodate the exact size of the buttons on the toolbar (Blattner, p. 876). Bott teaches the customization of the appearance of toolbar buttons (Bott, p. 45 and 48; Figure 2.9), but is silent as to button height. Thus, the teachings of Oran, Blattner, and Bott, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest destination toolbar constraints including a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation, such that when a button is moved from a source toolbar to a destination toolbar, the destination toolbar size does not change and all the buttons on the destination toolbar are a uniform size, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 13 and 24

Claims 13 and 24 as amended, contain features corresponding to those of claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claims 13 and 24 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has been amended to recite that the button constraints include a range of button heights and a range of button widths. Additionally, claim 8 has been amended to recite that the source toolbar constraints include a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation, and that the destination toolbar constraints include a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claim 8, as amended recites that the source toolbar constraints include a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation. The applicant respectfully submits that Blattner, Bott, and Oran, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest this additional feature of claim 8.

Claims 19 and 29

Claims 19 and 29, as amended, contain features corresponding to those of claim 8 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claims 19 and 29 are allowable for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 8.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from independent claims 8, 13, 19, 24, and 29, and thus are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges not otherwise paid or any credits to Deposit Account
No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 11, 2008

/Arrienne M. Lezak/

Arrienne Lezak

Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No.: 21876

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071